

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were presented for examination.

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in light of Verisign Digital ID (VID) in view of Verisign Authentication Services (VAS).

Applicants are hereby amending claims 1, 7, 10, 25 and 26 merely to distinctly claim their invention.

Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all pending claims, claims 1-26, as amended, are hereby respectfully requested.

Substance of the Interview.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time in conducting a telephone interview on November 8, 2006. Applicants believe that the time was spent effectively and significant progress was made. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representatives Michael Farn and Brian Brannon discussed claim 1 with Examiner Thomas Szymanski. During the interview, Applicants' representatives pointed out that the cited references do not disclose, or suggest, alone or in combination, the claimed feature of "convert[ing] the conglomerated authenticity certification into an individualized authenticity certification covering that entity's site." Specifically, Applicants' representatives pointed out that neither the VAS reference nor the VID reference discloses or suggests converting a conglomerated authenticity certification authenticating a service provider computer into individualized authenticity certifications that authenticate entity sites on the service provider computer.

The Examiner indicated that the conversion of an authenticity certification for a server into authenticity certifications for individual entities on the server appears to distinguish the

claimed invention from the cited references. However, the claim language should more clearly indicate that the “individualized authenticity certifications” apply to the entities on the server and that they are distinct from the “conglomerated authenticity certification” for the entire server. The Examiner indicated that the original claim language could be interpreted to read on a situation where exactly the same authenticity certification was used to authenticate both the server and the individual entity sites. Accordingly, to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to include language to the effect of “an individualized authenticity certification distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification” and “the individualized authenticity certifications are different for different entity sites.”

Amendments to the Specification.

Applicants have amended the specification to correct typographical errors. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by these amendments.

Claims 1-26: Neither VID nor VAS discloses “an individualized authenticity certification distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification, wherein the individualized authenticity certification covers the entity’s site and the individualized authenticity certifications are different for different entity sites.”

Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verisign Digital ID (VID) in view of Verisign Authentication Services (VAS). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1, which has been amended merely to define the structure of elements and the method of the invention with greater specificity, now recites “to convert the conglomerated authenticity certification into an individualized authenticity certification covering that entity’s site, wherein the individualized authenticity certification is distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification the and the individualized authenticity certifications are different for different entity.” (emphasis added) This feature is beneficial because it allows an individual entity’s identity to be verified using an individualized authenticity certificate unique to that entity, rather than merely verifying the identity of the shared host, or service provider computer, increasing the security of transactions with the entity. Converting the conglomerated authenticity certification into individualized authenticity certifications that are different for different entity sites reduces the cost needed to authenticate the identity of each entity. Thus, each entity on the server can acquire a unique individualized authenticity certification that verifies the identity of the entity from the conglomerated authenticity certification.

These claimed features of the present invention are not shown or suggested by any of the cited references taken either alone or in combination. At best, VID discloses providing an authenticity certificate to a server, where the authenticity certificate verifies the server identity. *See* Verisign Secure Site, Server FAQ. VID also discloses that individual sites can pre-purchase multiple digital identifications to distribute to employees, partners or customers. However, VID does not disclose any relationship between the server authentication and entity authentications. At best, VID discloses that a server can receive an authentication applicable to all entities hosted on the server and that individual entities can independently purchase authentications, unrelated to the server authentication, to distribute to users of the entity. VID does not disclose converting a server authentication into individualized authentications that uniquely identify different entities

on the server. Rather, at best, VID discloses a server authentication and separately purchased entity authentications. There is no relationship between the server authentication and the entity authentications disclosed in VID. Thus, VID does not disclose “convert[ing] a conglomerated authenticity certification into an individualized authenticity certification covering that entity’s site, wherein the individualized authenticity certification is distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification the and the individualized authenticity certifications are different for different entity sites,” as recited in amended claim 1.

VAS does not overcome this deficiency. VAS merely discloses that a digital certificate can be used to indicate that a web site’s identity has been authenticated. There is no disclosure in VAS of using a conglomerated authenticity certification to indicate that a server identity has been authenticated and of also using individualized authenticity certifications, distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification, to indicate the identity of each entity has been authenticated. VAS merely discloses authenticating that the identity of a particular entity has been authenticated, and does not disclose converting a server authenticity certificate into individual authenticity certificates that identify entities stored on the server. VAS does not disclose converting the server authentication into individualized authentications different for each entity on the server. Thus, VAS does not disclose “convert[ing] a conglomerated authenticity certification into an individualized authenticity certification covering that entity’s site, wherein the individualized authenticity certification is distinct from the conglomerated authenticity certification the and the individualized authenticity certifications are different for different entity sites,” as recited in amended claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 are patentably distinct from VID and VAS, both alone and in combination.

As independent claims 7, 10, 25 and 26 have also been amended to recite similar limitations as claim 1, the above arguments also apply to independent claims 7, 10, 25, 26 and their respective dependent claims. Thus, claims 7-9, 10-24, 25 and 26 are also patentably distinct over VID and VAS, both alone and in combination.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Closing

Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-26 as amended, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicant's attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below. Otherwise, Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance of all claims herein, claims 1-26, and therefore an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2006

By: /Brian G. Brannon/
Brian G. Brannon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,219
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
(650) 335-7823 (Tel)
(650) 938-5200 (Fax)